

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action objects to the drawings and requires the submission of formal drawings replacing the existing informal drawings. Sixteen sheets of replacement drawings are included herewith. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Office Action objects to the background at line 13 and requests a change from the word “business” to “businesses”. The word business is not included in the background art at any location indicated by line 13. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that where the term “business” is used in the background (Paragraph 2, ll. 15-16) that it is properly used in its singular form. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action objects to the Summary of Invention, lines 22-25 as only a single “navigational choice”. The phrase “navigational choice” is not included in the summary at any location indicated by lines 22-25. It is not clear what the subject of the objection is. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action objects to claims 11, 35 and 37 because it is “unclear which term the applicant would like to use for “no response”. Both have the same meaning, and claim 11 has been amended to conform to that used in claims 35 and 37. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1-44 were pending. Claims 1, 8, 11, 25 and 41 have been amended, claims 3-4 have been canceled, and claims 45-46 have been added. Hence, claims 1-2 and 5-46 remain pending.

The Office Action of 5/4/2006 rejects claims 1-5 and 8-44 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Noble (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,634). Applicant respectfully amends in part and traverses in part to address the rejection.

The Office Action of 5/4/2006 also rejects claims 6-7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noble (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,634) in view of Ainslie (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,599). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As amended, claim 1 provides a method for interacting with one or more recipients that includes, inter alia, selecting an approach that includes a script. The script

includes at least a first presentation and a second presentation. The first presentation is selected, and at least a portion of a communication provided to the recipient includes the first presentation provided in an order indicated by the script via the conversation control system. Such a method allows, for example, the playing of a script in one or more different languages or in a softer or more aggressive voice. As one particular example, a human operator that has a difficult accent may be used to interpret the requests of a customer and the conversation control system can be used to communicate with the customer using pre-recorded scripts that do not exhibit the difficult accent of the human operator by selection of the recipient appropriate presentation. See e.g., Specification at Fig. 1B, ¶ 97.

In stark contrast, as Applicant understands Noble, it discloses a method that provides an ability for a TSR to communicate with a party using a script including only a single presentation. Noble at col. 2, ll. 35-50. Using the method, the TSR selects the script and controls the playing of the selected script to the receiving party. While such an approach provides an ability to deliver a consistent message it does not provide any ability to control the aesthetics of the message. Hence, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1. Further, claims 2, 5-7 and 45-46 properly depend from allowable claim 1. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to the aforementioned dependent claims and allowance thereof for at least this reason.

Dependent claim 45 further includes selecting between two or more different scripts from an approach. Such a process allows for selecting the same approach, but with, for example, a passive or aggressive script. See e.g., Specification at paragraph 87. In stark contrast, as Applicant understands Noble, it does not disclose selection between multiple scripts associated with the same approach. Hence, for at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claim 45.

Yet further, claim 7 provides for displaying a message graphically in American Sign Language. Neither Noble nor Ainslie disclose, teach or suggest such an approach. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 7 for at least this additional reason.

As amended, claim 8 provides pseudo-conversation system for use between one or more users and one or more recipients. The pseudo-conversation system includes, *inter alia*, a computer readable medium that includes an approach comprising a script that is provided in a first presentation and a second presentation. The computer readable medium further comprises instructions executable by the computer to receive a selection from a user indicating the first presentation of the script and to access an audio output associated with the first presentation of the script. Such a system allows, for example, the playing of a script in one or more different languages or in a softer or more aggressive voice. As one particular example, a human operator that has a difficult accent may be used to interpret the requests of a customer and the conversation control system can be used to communicate with the customer using pre-recorded scripts that do not exhibit the difficult accent of the human operator by selection of the recipient appropriate presentation. See e.g., Specification at Fig. 1B, ¶ 97.

Again, as Applicant understands Noble, it discloses a system that provides an ability for a TSR to communicate with a party using a script including only a single presentation. Noble at col. 2, ll. 35-50. Hence, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 8. Further, claims 9-24 properly depend from allowable claim 8. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to the aforementioned dependent claims and allowance thereof for at least this reason.

As amended, claim 25 provides a method for providing a consistent presentation to one or more recipients. The method includes, *inter alia*, presenting a first script and a second script to a user, wherein the first script is associated with a first presentation and a second presentation, and wherein the second script is associated with a third presentation and a fourth presentation. As previously set forth, Noble does not disclose such a method. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 25. Further, claims 26-40 properly depend from allowable claim 25. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to the aforementioned dependent claims and allowance thereof for at least this reason.

As amended, claim 41 provides a method for responding to inquiries. The method includes, *inter alia*, receiving an inquiry from a recipient and presenting a first

script and a second script to a user. Based on the inquiry from the recipient, a request for the first script item is received. Noble does not disclose presenting two or more script items to a user in response to an inquiry from a recipient. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 41. Further, claims 42-44 properly depend from allowable claim 41. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to the aforementioned dependent claims and allowance thereof for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Hence, an early allowance of all such claims is earnestly requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees under 37 CFR 1.136, to the deposit account of the undersigned, Account No. 50-3897.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 720-266-4728.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Mark Hamilton/

Douglas M. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 47,629

The Hamilton Law Firm PC
8555 W. Belleview Ave. G21-139
Littleton, CO 80123
720-266-4728

Replacement Drawings:

Please find attached the following sixteen (16) sheets of replacement drawings. The replacement drawings have been formally redrawn from the original filed drawings, and no new matter is added.